DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 727 CE 037 736

TITLE	Federal Job Training Partnership Act for Veterans. Hearing before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Ninety-Eighth Congress, First Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U. S., Washington, D. C. House Committee on Government Operations.
PUB DATE	25 Apr 83
NOTE	40p.; Not available in paper copy due to small type.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Needs; Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Hearings; *Job Training; Postsecondary Education; Program Implementation; Program Improvement; Student Financial Aid; *Training Allowances; Veterans; *Veterans Education
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 98th; *Job Training Partnership Act 1982; Vietnam Veterans

ABSTRACT

This document is a transcript of a Congressional hearing conducted for the purpose of discussing the workings of the new federal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) as it applies to veterans. Witnesses included various officials of veterans groups, especially Vietnam veterans from Massachusetts, state officials of Massachusetts, a representative of the Veterans Employment and Training Service of the U.S. Department of Labor, and U.S. Representative Barney Frank who conducted the hearing. During the hearing, witnesses emphasized that the JTPA, as now written, allots only about $2.8 million for veterans' job training, amounting to only about ten dollars per Vietnam veteran. The money allotted for veterans' training in Massachusetts amounts to only about $218,000. The witnesses stated that a much greater level of funding is needed if the JTPA is to make an impact on veterans' unemployment. The witnesses also stressed the need for representation of Vietnam veterans on the Private Industry Councils (PICs) that are responsible for overseeing the JPTA programs in each state. They said the councils should have a veteran membership about equal to the percent of veterans in the population. Another topic discussed by witnesses included the necessity of extending the length of time for Vietnam veterans to use their educational benefits. Prepared statements by some of the witnesses are also included in the document. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FEDERAL JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT FOR VETERANS

ED237727

HEARING

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

APRIL 25, 1983

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CE037736

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
23-704 O WASHINGTON : 1983

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JACK BROOKS, Texas, *Chairman*

DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
DON FUQUA, Florida
JOHN CONYERS, JR., Michigan
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
GLENN ENGLISH, Oklahoma
ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS, Georgia
HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
TED WEISS, New York
MIKE SYNAR, Oklahoma
STEPHEN L. NEAL, North Carolina
DOUG BARNARD, JR., Georgia
BARNEY FRANK, Massachusetts
TOM LANTOS, California
RONALD D. COLEMAN, Texas
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
BARBARA BOXER, California
SANDER M. LEVIN, Michigan
BUDDY MACKAY, Florida
MEL LEVINE, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
JOHN M. SPRATT, JR., South Carolina
JOE KOLTER, Pennsylvania
BEN ERDREICH, Alabama

FRANK HORTON, New York
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
THOMAS N. KINDNESS, Ohio
ROBERT S. WALKER, Pennsylvania
LYLE WILLIAMS, Ohio
WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR., Pennsylvania
RAYMOND J. McGRATH, New York
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
DAN BURTON, Indiana
JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR., Maine
TOM LEWIS, Florida
ALFRED A. (AL) McCANDLESS, California
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho
DAN SCHAEFER, Colorado

WILLIAM M. JONES, *General Counsel*
JOHN E. MOORE, *Staff Administrator*
JOHN M. DUNCAN, *Minority Staff Director*

MANPOWER AND HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE

BARNEY FRANK, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

MEL LEVINE, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
JOHN M. SPRATT, JR., South Carolina
JOE KOLTER, Pennsylvania
BEN ERDREICH, Alabama

JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR., Maine
DAN BURTON, Indiana
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois

EX OFFICIO

JACK BROOKS, Texas

FRANK HORTON, New York

JAMES M. DOLAN, JR., *Staff Director*
MARY BETH CAHILL, *Investigator*
JUNE SAXTON, *Clerk*
THOMAS F. HOUSTON, *Minority Professional Staff*

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on April 25, 1983	1
Statement of—	
Camacho, Paul, executive director, Commission on the Concerns of Vietnam Vets	9
Camara, John, president, Vietnam Veterans of Southeastern Massachusetts University	11
Ducey, Richard, executive director, Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program of Massachusetts, Inc	13
Frank, Hon. Barney, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts, and chairman, Manpower and Housing Subcommittee: Opening statement	1
Hanratty, Patricia, assistant secretary of economic affairs, Commonwealth of Massachusetts	6
King, Michael G., executive officer, Vietnam Veterans Association of Boston	19
Moakley, Robert, Acting Director, Veterans Employment and Training Service, U.S. Department of Labor	2
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by—	
Ducey, Richard, executive director, Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program of Massachusetts, Inc.: Prepared statement	15–17
Kerry, Lt. Gov. John F., Commonwealth of Massachusetts: Prepared statement	25–30
APPENDIX	
Material submitted for the record	33

FEDERAL JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT FOR VETERANS

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1983

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
MANPOWER AND HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
North Dartmouth, Mass.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9 a.m., at Southeastern Massachusetts University, Old Westport Road, Group VI, room 153, North Dartmouth, Mass., Hon. Barney Frank (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representative Barney Frank.

Also present: Mary Beth Cahill, staff investigator.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN FRANK

Mr. FRANK. We will come to order. This is a hearing of the Subcommittee on Manpower and Housing of the Committee on Government Operations. We are here at Southeastern Massachusetts University for the specific purpose of inquiring into the progress of implementation of those provisions of the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982, which refers to veterans of Vietnam.

In the years since the end of the American military intervention of Vietnam a number of promises have been made by the American Government to Vietnam veterans and the record of the Government in carrying out those promises has been a dismal one.

It took the country far too long to recognize in the first place what the debt was that was owed to Vietnam veterans. They are the first soldiers of American history in terms of war to find not a grateful nation, but an embarrassed one, in some cases an angry one; and for reasons that do not stand out logically, a nation prepared to blame some of the Vietnam veterans for having been sent to fight a war at their country's request.

It took too long for the Nation to recognize the unfair treatment that the Vietnam veterans had received and it has taken too long since to implement some of the promises that were made. They were many years too late in trying to adopt programs to try and deal with the problem of Vietnam veterans.

These are problems of people who returned from war, unlike people who returned from World War II to find the economy wasn't growing at a rapid rate. We find structural problems in the United States. Prices paid for military equipment and salaries have risen since Vietnam, and the decade since has been a very difficult one, from the standpoint of the American economy.

This has compounded the difficulty that the veterans of Vietnam face of getting reintegrated, so they have comeback at a time of great economic difficulty. They have found in some cases a misunderstanding public, and the Government, in contrast of previous wars, has been very hesitant and uncertain about the debt that it has owed people.

They have begun some programs that do seek to work with the Vietnam veterans, brought about by and large by the Vietnam veterans themselves, and the organizations they have joined. The Federal Government has a very sour history in terms of the promises that have been made, programs that have been setup for job training, and small business loans, only to find the administration refusing to administer them.

Many of us say that this will not happen with the Job Training Partnership Act. The terms of that act which give special treatment to the veterans, people who have a much higher unemployment rate than their peers in terms of age and experience.

We are determined that the Federal Government will this time meet its obligation, and many of us hope—this is just the first step in recognizing that a full set of programs are necessary to help the Vietnam veterans reintegrate themselves into the economic society which they left at that society's request to go fight battles.

This is an issue we will be pursuing on a national level, but I also think it is important that this is going to be implemented on a State-by-State basis. There will be hearings by the congressional committee on the various implementation activities in certain States, and at the request of the Vietnam veterans in Massachusetts and the organizations that I work with. I have agreed to hold this first hearing of my subcommittee which has jurisdiction over this act in Massachusetts to get a report on the progress of implementation of those sections.

This is only a first of a series of hearings that this subcommittee is going to have. This will be on various States and on the provisions of the national legislation because many of us are determined that we will, unfortunately for the first time, begin to do justice for the people who fought the Vietnam war at their country's request.

Our first witness today is Mr. Robert Moakley, who is Acting Director of the Veterans Employment Service, U.S. Department of Labor.

Mr. Moakley?

STATEMENT OF ROBERT MOAKLEY, ACTING DIRECTOR, VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. MOAKLEY. Thank you, Congressman Frank.

On behalf of the Veterans Employment and Training Service of the U.S. Department of Labor, may I say that it is an honor and a privilege to appear here today to discuss the employment needs of the Vietnam veteran and the implications of the Job Training Partnership Act.

Their needs are very evident. At this moment over 890,000 Vietnam-era veterans are unemployed. This figure represents a rise of 23 percent over this time last year.

The unemployment rate of the Vietnam-era veterans 25 to 29 years old is 43 percent higher than that of male non-veterans in the same age group. The Vietnam-era veteran is the most maligned, most mistreated, most misunderstood member of our society, and the minority Vietnam veteran suffers the most adverse effects.

Little has been done to help the Vietnam veteran take his rightful place in the mainstream of our society, and much has been done to hinder him.

I view the Job Training Partnership Act as a step in the right direction, if it is properly implemented.

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, or CETA as it was more commonly known, did little for our veterans, but there are some distinct differences between CETA and the Job Training Partnership Act. CETA's objective was to coordinate agencies; the Job Training Partnership Act coordinates services.

The Job Training Partnership Act changes the roles and relationships of the private sector, State and Federal governments. The Governor plays the central role in the Job Training Partnership Act. The State, rather than the Federal Government, determines the service delivery areas; the Governor, rather than local officials, receives all of the funds, and the Job Training Partnership Act emphasis is on training, not public service employment.

The implementation of this act is not an exclusively Federal process. The name of the bill stresses partnership. Its structure emphasizes the importance of partnership, partnership between the private and public sectors, Federal and State governments, private industry councils, and local elected officials, and among the numerous groups in the community who have an interest in seeing that those at a disadvantage in the labor market are prepared for, and placed in, jobs that will provide them economic independence. The implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act should be carried out in the spirit of partnership.

The Job Training Partnership Act repeals and replaces CETA. Its primary objective, as I have stated, is to train people to increase their employment and earning capabilities. And the implicit parts of the Job Training Partnership Act are the following things:

(1) That training is the vehicle through which an individual's skills and competencies are increased—thereby increasing the individual's long-term employment and earnings;

(2) That the Federal resources available to be invested in training are scarce and therefore, must be focused tightly on those who need and can benefit from the program;

(3) To provide training to the greatest number of people the services offered must be only those that are absolutely essential to increasing skills and competencies and administrative costs must be cut back; and

(4) That the States are in the best position to assess the types of organizational arrangements and resource commitments that will yield the greatest earning and employment gains for participants and finally, that the training programs can be effective only if they successfully provide participants with skills that are needed.

These principles underlie the Job Training Partnership Act's design from the Federal perspective and will guide the implementation of the program.

Title 4(c) of the act authorizes the Department of Labor to operate federally administered national programs targeted to meet the needs of disabled, Vietnam-era, and recently separated veterans. Five percent of the funds under this title are earmarked for Veteran's programs, but I do not feel that this is enough.

Because of their extremely high unemployment rate, Vietnam-era veterans should automatically qualify for programs under title 2 of the act which are designed for the economically disadvantaged. The law should be amended, or regulations promulgated, which make Vietnam-era veterans eligible to participate under this title.

And in conclusion, if we are to include Vietnam veterans as members of society, we must include them in the formulation of programs which affect them.

The size and composition of the State Job Coordinating Council and the PICS are determined by the chief elected official in the geographical area. There is no requirement that veterans be represented on these committees. Because veterans have such an important stake in the development and implementation of the programs which affect them, I recommend that regulations be published which require Veteran membership on the State Coordinating Council and each of the PICS.

I would also like to point out that under title 4(c) there is only $9.4 million for national funds for these programs. If you figure that among the unemployment rate of the Vietnam-era veterans, it comes out to a little more than $10 per person for the unemployed veteran. When you include the disabled veterans from other wars, that figure is reduced even more. The funds under title 4(c) of the act are very scarce.

This is why I recommend that the regulations be issued or the law changed and you as a member of the oversight committee, Congressman, are in a position to do these things to include Vietnam veterans as a targeted group, as a disadvantaged group for coverage under title 2 of this act and this would give them greater training and earning capabilities.

The former Governor King had included Vietnam-era veterans as a targeted group for equal employment opportunities by executive order before leaving office. He had recognized the need in the State, and I think the Federal Government should recognize that same need and include them as a disadvantaged group so they will be eligible for more programs.

The funds are so limited on this title, 4(c), that the programs will not assist a great number of Vietnam-era veterans, in my opinion. I am sure that the programs that will be run under this title will be more effective, but the capability to service the number of people in great need just is not there.

Thank you, Mr. Frank.

Mr. FRANK. Thank you, Mr. Moakley.

Your suggestion is that in title 2 of the act, which has a definition now of economically disadvantaged, et cetera, you would recommend that we add Vietnam veterans as a category in that so

whether or not a Vietnam veteran met that criteria, he would still be eligible?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I would, Congressman, because the same definition appeared in CETA and veterans were not afforded opportunities under CETA because they did not meet the economically disadvantaged criteria set out under that act. In fact, the act went as far as to take service pay into account and just because they had been separated from the service within the past 3 years, they were ineligible to participate under CETA as economically disadvantaged, so I think they have to be named as a group because of their extremely high unemployment rate.

Mr. FRANK. Under title 4(c) you say in the current fiscal year there is $9.4 million——

Mr. MOAKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. FRANK. Even if we are successful in a substantial increase in the appropriations for the next fiscal year, we would still be talking $12, $13 million, so what—do you have a figure for Massachusetts' share?

Mr. MOAKLEY. $218,000 has been allocated for Massachusetts. The allocation for title 4(c) funds is unlike the allocation for the rest of the bill. It is distributed much in the same manner as the money for the Disabled Veterans Outreach program. It is distributed by the number of Vietnam-era and disabled veterans in the State.

So, because of this, we get a larger share of the money because of the high veteran population in the State but $218,000 is not a lot of money to operate a program even though there are restrictions in the law as to how much of this—how much of this money can be used for administrative expenses and keeps administrative expenses down.

Mr. FRANK. Fifteen percent?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Yes. Under title 2, and up to 20 percent under title 4.

Mr. FRANK. Do you have an estimate of the eligible population of the Vietnam veterans? Do we have any sense of how many Vietnam vets in Massachusetts are unemployed right now?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I do not have total figures for unemployed veterans I had statistics up until about a year and a half ago, but so many of them have exhausted their eligibility for unemployment benefits that they are not recorded anyplace as being unemployed at this time.

Mr. FRANK. And those are people who don't have jobs——

Mr. MOAKLEY. They don't have jobs. They no longer are eligible for benefits, so they do not show up statistically.

Mr. FRANK. If you are unemployed too long, you are no longer unemployed statistically, you are unemployed economically? You are saying that the 4(c) funds are going to be inadequate and unless Vietnam veterans are found eligible such as title 2, we won't be able to do it?

Mr. MOAKLEY. That is my opinion.

Mr. FRANK. Let me ask you, as one of the supervisors at the Labor Department, you mentioned also a suggestion that veterans ought to be able to participate in these programs. With regard to the establishment of State councils there is nothing in the law that

requires Vietnam veterans to be included. I wonder, you wouldn't know on a nationwide basis, perhaps, do we have any indication of how many Vietnam veterans are being appointed for representation in the various States to serve on these councils?

Mr. MOAKLEY. We have no statistics at this time as to the number. I met with the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Secretary of Economic Affairs in January prior to the establishment of the council in Massachusetts and I had recommended at that time, and they seemed to be agreeable, to have Vietnam veterans participate on the council. I understand that there was a Vietnam veteran appointed and because of his physical disabilities, he has been unable to attend the meetings and has resigned his position.

Mr. FRANK. Let me ask, if I could, write to you through your Department—or if it is appropriate I will write to the Secretary—but I would like to get a list, if I could, from the Department of the number of Vietnam veterans who serve on councils all across the country. I think it would be useful if we could get a State-by-State breakdown because it is obviously something that we would prefer to leave to the flexibility of the local officials; but if necessary, I would be prepared to propose either in the regulations or if that wasn't accepted in the statute that there be some requirement of representation of Vietnam veterans, and I say that because unfortunately I think we have had a pattern in this country that people fail to appoint veterans when the time comes.

Mr. MOAKLEY. We are in a unique position in Massachusetts where we have the State agency, the Massachusetts Veteran Service Agency, and the law does allow for members of the State agencies to participate on the PICS and on the State Coordinating Council and it was also my recommendation that members of the Massachusetts Veteran Service Agency be appointed as members of the PICS in their respective communities. Of course, that will not help along the Federal level.

Mr. FRANK. Would you expect that there would be Vietnam veterans on the PICS as well?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I would be hopeful that there would, sir.

Mr. FRANK. I think if we wanted veteran representation, we would want it from those veterans who had particular beneficiaries.

Mr. MOAKLEY. The local elected officials are the ones who select the members of the PICS, so it would be up to the local elected official as to whether there were representation or not.

Mr. FRANK. I think that I probably will be writing to them elsewhere also in the country to suggest that there would be representation of the Vietnam veterans. That is all the comments that I have and I thank you for coming and your comments.

Our next witness is Dr. Patricia Hanratty, assistant secretary of economic affairs, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

STATEMENT OF PATRICIA HANRATTY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Ms. HANRATTY. Representative Frank, I would like to thank you on behalf of Secretary Murphy for this opportunity to discuss the needs of veterans. She cannot be here personally because she is tes-

tifying at the Massachusetts State budget hearings in the State house today.

In Massachusetts, we have attempted to serve in two different ways Vietnam veterans, though we do not and would not argue that they have been served in the most optimum way possible in part because—in large part because of funding restrictions.

Through the division of employment security we have had an Outreach program to Vietnam vets both by having local veterans employment representatives in every local DES office and also by having 64 counselors for disabled vets throughout the DES system. In addition there are 32 outreach stations in the DES system. Overall, about 11.8 percent, almost 12 percent of DES clients are veterans.

In the CETA system, in large part because of the restricted funds and because of, as Mr. Moakley indicated, the economically disadvantaged restrictions, Vietnam veterans have not been served as much or at the same levels as in the DES System. Less than 9 percent of the CETA clients have been Vietnam-era veterans.

Overall in 1982, fiscal year 1982, 33,000 Vietnam veterans applied for service under either DES or CETA in Massachusetts.

We too look to JTPA, to the Job Training Partnership Act, as a new way and better way of serving veterans. However there are some clarifications that are needed.

I strongly support the regulation clarification that Mr. Moakley discussed particularly with regard to the PICS; veterans are not specified in the regulations. We are developing guidelines now at the State level for certification of PICS and vets are not in the Federal legislation's list of different organizations and groups that should be represented.

Clarification of some strong message from the Department of Labor, Congressman, will be helpful in that regard.

In terms of title 2, opening that up further to veterans, that will also be helpful. At the same time, the JTPA funds in Massachusetts are very restricted. We should not look at the Job Training Partnership Act as a very high level of funding for veterans or for the employment training community in Massachusetts; in fact it is a distinct reduction and a continuation of a reduction which has taken place over the last 4 years.

In Massachusetts we have attempted to do some additional planning, the division of employment security has submitted a consent paper to the Office of Veterans Affairs for funding on-the-job training programs. The request for that proposal alone was $500,000, which is more than twice the amount which would be allocated to the State. Obviously, the funding levels under title 4(c) are absurdly low and we need more funding in order to be able to serve vets.

One of the things we found in CETA is that an Outreach program is needed. They need such services. They need outreach. They need counseling and with reduced administrative funds and general funds, it is difficult to provide those services. We will make every effort to do that. We will utilize the funds which we have. We will apply for discretionary funds to attempt to increase the funds available to the employment training community, but in the absence of more funds, it is difficult to service the veterans at the level we would like to see them served, so we ask for your contin-

ued support and strong argumentation for further funding for JTPA and for clarification on the regulations and expansion of the title 2 disadvantaged categories.

We are aware of the $218,000. I had not heard the $10 per veteran across-the-country figure. It is obviously appalling. We know that training programs require about $2,000–$3,000 per participant; $10 is not a lot in terms of training, so I would like to stress once again our need for and confidence in your argumentation for funding.

Thank you.

Mr. FRANK. Thank you.

Let me ask you, with regard to the regulations being developed that you mentioned for the membership on the PICS, who is developing those?

Ms. HANRATTY. My office.

Mr. FRANK. I would hope we might get some reference to Vietnam vets in there. I think it would be a useful thing to do and I think we should make it clear and I wouldn't want any contrary implication to go out, there is nothing in the law that says that Vietnam veterans are eligible under title 4(c).

There are other guidelines and unfortunately because of the circumstances, there will be Vietnam veterans who would otherwise qualify under title 2 and I certainly hope and I think it would be the intention of the Congress that Vietnam veterans that qualify under the titles would be given very full consideration; so we do expect that more than those under 4(c) will be there, but on the other hand, it is a little bit hypocritical, it seems to me, to recognize that there is a special need to create a category for Vietnam veterans and fund it so inadequately and that is the pattern that we have had in the country all too often to make the verbal promise that we are going to provide assistance and then make it a source of disappointment, but precisely that reason, because the CETA side is so small and I think it is important to get Vietnam veteran representation on the PICS and I would hope that as the regulations develop that would happen.

Obviously, it is the intent of Congress that it is flexible to the State and local agencies in selecting the membership, but I think if there were not to be sufficient representation for Vietnam vets, that would lead us to tighten up.

Ms. HANRATTY. Two further comments, if I could make them. We do look at the 10-percent window, 10 percent of those served under the Job Training Partnership Act do not have to fall into the disadvantaged category as another opportunity to serve Vietnam veterans. Further, on the State Job Training Coordinating Council a veteran was appointed and is resigning and another veteran will be appointed to represent the interest of veterans, so there is certainly commitment on the State level and we would in our briefings and discussions with local elected officials be sure that they have sufficient information and knowledge to go forward——

Mr. FRANK. One question has been raised. I think it will be raised later. I will pass it along. Some State officials, even assuming that the Vietnam veteran who is on the coordinating council, 1 out of 50 is not a very large representation given the multiplicity of needs.

I have looked through the list, and I think if he is the only Vietnam veteran that he will be unique in being the sole representative on the council and I think he might very well find himself overwhelmed on the council.

So perhaps thought can be given also to that question. But I do welcome what you say about the 10 percent. There is some intention on the part of the State to see that Vietnam veterans get a high degree of eligibility and that additional 10 percent that is undesignated in the statute—is that what it says?—it is flexibility with regard to 10 percent for those who serve.

Ms. HANRATTY. Ten percent of the population served do not have to be categorized as economically disadvantaged. There are a variety of groups that can go into that category, one of which I think would fall in that would be Vietnam veterans.

Mr. FRANK. I would hope so. The statistics I have seen on unemployment among Vietnam vets are very scary and I think we are talking about a situation that goes on much longer. We are talking about people who will never get into the labor force because we are going to be approaching the age where, in addition to the unemployment as a result of Vietnam, they are going to come to an age that is harder and harder to get employment. Also you get discouraged, because of being a Vietnam veteran, the kinds of discrimination faced does not lead everybody to keep trying, trying, trying, trying; so I think that is a very good argument.

Thank you very much.

The next witness is Mr. Paul Camacho, executive director of the Commission on the Concerns of Vietnam Vets.

STATEMENT OF PAUL CAMACHO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COMMISSION ON THE CONCERNS OF VIETNAM VETS

Mr. CAMACHO. I would like to outline my text here and then go on to some other points. I want to thank you on behalf of the Commission for the opportunity to testify.

You know the Commission has been in effect only about a year; our mandate is to study the concerns of the Vietnam veterans; we found out from several public hearings that they run from very staple issues, to very peculiar or particular issues to the homecoming and the nature of the war.

At hand we are talking about employment, but before we get into that, I should point out that none of these issues is independent. They are not puzzles. There is no solution to one. Rather, they are superimposed on each other and it makes for a very complex social problem. Employment, we found, is connected to the levels of training and that in turn is connected to, in many cases, discrimination. Unemployment, being conservative, has jumped to 15 percent; 15 percent of the veterans in the Commonwealth are unemployed, running with 260,000 Vietnam era, that means 40,000 Vietnam veterans would be unemployed in the State. At least that.

You are getting to the training. We have had people come to us who have been laid off, like over at the shipyard in Quincy. I can think of one in particular. Today we need more education and more training. The days of one career is over. You have five and six careers in your working lifetime now. You need multiple skills,

so my vote is that this job training program doesn't end up teaching people leaf raking, which is, of course, one of the objections to all these kinds of Federal programs, rather we want to put into the private sector, into the Digital, into the Westinghouse and into the job market.

Another fact that we should jump on, too, is the initial findings, the skeleton of that interim report. It is coming out as S. 1824, hopefully within a few more weeks. We found out a lot of discrimination, in fact, some of the civil service cases that we handled in terms of advocacy dealt with discrimination.

For Vietnam veterans—there is a bad public perception out there and one that has been advocated or pushed by the media industry; that violent veteran myth is all over the Commonwealth. It is all over the Nation and many people have that—many people in responsible positions have that opinion and, therefore, it reflects itself in employment. Again in the civil service case, the person involved said, but we have had a bad experience with one Vietnam veteran.

I mean, for the Vietnam veterans, there is no scoundral allowed. It is a negative, privileged group at this point in time, and we go unrecognized. We are a minority without portfolio; that was the expression used here. In other words, we are never in the statistics. We've never been put in the statistics as far as I can tell, and that is one thing we should have done for us. We should have our stats and that gets us to the Job Training Partnership Act as an employment thing and how we are going to fare in this. My fear and the Commission's fear is that we are not going to fare well, in some way parallels CETA, well we didn't do well in CETA at all.

The only title where there was a lot of ballyhoo in CETA was title 6, when Jimmy Carter mandated the 35-percent figure. The Vietnam Veterans' Civil Council found out that no more than 19 percent of the title 6 really got to Vietnam veterans. In some cases it went up to 25 percent, but the overall figure just in title 6, that was only in title 6 and that was only for the 1 year, all that dropped out.

There were manpower councils, community councils where veterans could have had input, but those community councils were ineffective in the sense that they could never force anything on the program administrators; consequently there was no input at all.

So what are we saying with this program here? Well, already the Governor's State job training planning coordinating council was inefficient. They put John Kelly on it and all of the veterans came to this agreement. They put John Kelly on because he was a paralyzed veteran. We feel that this is the case.

Then, when he went to a meeting, they stuck him by himself in a corner next to a coffee machine. He had to wait 15, 20 minutes for a guard to come and open the door because being confined to his wheelchair, he couldn't get out, so there were no provisions taken for him and nothing got done at that meeting. That is one of the things that happened. If that went there, then what is going to happen in the PICS?

I remember being one of the people in attendance in CETA, this is in Cambridge, and there was no chance for Vietnam veterans to get good input in there, and this is in a State where we have the

support of the Speaker of the House McGee, in a State where we have the support of the house president, Bolger, in a State where we have support inside the delegation; you are one of those gentlemen.

We have Joseph Moakley. We have the Speaker of the House, Thomas O'Neill, he is for us and yet we are losing out. So what is happening nationally? If it looks like we are going to do better in Massachusetts on this, then what is happening nationally? We don't have the access. We need title 2. It has to be opened up. We have to be a category an absolute category, to be put in title 2 for sure, and it has to be written somewhere that we are mandated to be on these private industry councils. One follows the other. Without being on the private industry councils, then we have no input into what is decided over our fate.

Now, I know the technical constituency of those professional social workers don't like the demonstrative clients to have any input over what is going on, but if we are going to get anyplace at all, we are going to have to have some influence and that needs to be represented in the PICS. Most of the people that administer these programs suffer what is called the fallacy of sympathetic rejection and that has been written up in several books. The problem is that it is the kind of professional person administering the—social programs that has a lower opinion, you know, of the poor "we will try to help the impoverished here"—and we never get access to being able to help ourselves so we always end up getting programs that treat symptoms and never really deal with problems.

I want to thank you again for letting us be here and this entire commission thanks you for the opportunity to testify.

Mr. FRANK. Thank you.

I think what we will probably do is go on to your colleagues and then we can probably discuss it.

Next we have Mr. John Camara, president of the Vietnam Veterans of Southeastern Massachusetts University.

Mr. CAMARA. Thank you for having me.

Mr. FRANK. We will have a brief recess until we get this straightened out.

[Recess taken.]

Mr. FRANK. We will try it again. Thank you very much. Go ahead, Mr. Camara.

STATEMENT OF JOHN CAMARA, PRESIDENT, VIETNAM VETERANS OF SOUTHEASTERN MASSACHUSETTS UNIVERSITY

Mr. CAMARA. Thank you for having me. I don't have the stats that my brother mentioned. I only come here and talk about the veterans that are coming to me to talk about and my own personal experiences. Title 2, we definitely have to have a separate category specifying Vietnam veterans. As I was saying, I can tell you the problems that I encountered and people that come to my office and talk to me about it.

We definitely have to be categorized in title 2. That definitely has to be done. As far as the private industry for PICS, we definitely have to be represented on that, too. This scares me right here,

this training part here. Now, this is a high tech State. I am going to pick Massachusetts because that is the State I am from. This training job. What are they going to train them for, to rake leaves which sometimes happens? They say, "Well, we trained them to rake leaves. We trained them to be a janitor."

That is not giving a man or woman an opportunity for the high tech. The training has to be more specified. If you are going to train somebody in New Bedford, the only industry is sewing or textiles and without going to a training school, how are they going to get trained for sweeping of the fabrics on the floor? I think that has to be checked into to find out what the definition of training is going to be.

Training, we think it should be something like computers where he can raise his family and make a living and get into housing. Nowadays with a GI bill you can't get a decent house. Restrictions are tight on a GI bill as it is. You might be able to get to a good bank and get a loan on an initial low payment, downpayment on a house, but after that you still have to have a job to keep up the payments, the taxes and the family, and this really scares me, that training.

It is going to be a veteran. He is going to go through 6 months to learn how to rake a leaf and that is all he is going to do. I am really worried about this. I have contracts with these other things, CETA and all that, and I have seen it and it doesn't work.

If they do pick veterans, they are using somebody that they can manipulate or control or somebody that they have worked for before that has gone there which with a little power of suggestion—I think something should be done where the veterans in the area in that State has some say as to who gets picked. I don't know how that can be done. Maybe by a vote; I don't know.

I think they should have some say on who is going to represent them. They could pick some colonel or general. He doesn't really care. He is some adviser for a business in the area making $40,000 to $50,000. He is representing me? He has none of my problems. He has a house; he has plenty of money. I am not knocking that down; that is great, but yet can he see down into the dirt where we are? Where we are trying to struggle? That is all I can ask you. A lot of my brother vets can't.

Mr. FRANK. Thank you. We will pursue that with some questions when we finish with the whole panel.

I would say with regard to—and maybe if I can go back, I want to comment on that, specifically for the job training, as to what jobs can be trained for. There is a specific provision of the bill that says you are supposed to find the jobs that are available for people and train them for those jobs. There is supposed to be a matching between the kind of training that people get and the kinds of jobs that would be available, but I think Dr. Hanratty- let me now turn to Richard Ducey who is the executive director of the Vietnam veterans leadership program.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD DUCEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, VIETNAM VETERANS LEADERSHIP PROGRAM OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC.

Mr. DUCEY. Thank you very much.

I would like to say in regard to Mr. Camara's remarks, that there is a real irony in the fact that after 10 years of self-help programs, and lobbying ourselves for the recognition that we've needed, there are those who now seek to step forward and control the implementations of our benefits programs where that control would result in less than representative input from the Vietnam veteran community.

During the war years, America was enjoying an expanding economy, virtually no inflation and a wide range of blue collar vocations. This last point is especially significant for Vietnam veterans because so many of them came from blue collar backgrounds. When they returned home and found employment within the industrial sector, they saw no reason for additional vocational education since industrial jobs, especially with overtime, paid so well.

Now 15 years later, this sector of the employment market is in a shambles, the delimiting date for GI bill benefits has come and gone for most Vietnam veterans, and many find themselves unemployed with outdated and useless job skills in the period of their lives that should represent their peak earning years.

Many economists predict that there will be so many changes in American industries such as steel, automobiles and their supporting companies, that a whole generation of workers may be wiped out.

Speaking as a former "rap group" counselor, I would like to make one other point. Vietnam veterans grew up in an era that developed and supported a very strong work ethic. Many veterans who still suffer marginal readjustment problems could be socially rehabilitated by employment opportunities that offer dignity and a sense of self-worth. Failure to recognize this within a therapeutic framework not only creates difficulties for the mental health community but may actually become the single core issue which prevents the rehabilitation process.

Dr. Arthur Blank, Chief of the VA Outreach Services Division, has testified at a session of the National Economic Commission that 40 percent of their clients have employment problems. For many of these veterans a decent job could be the road home.

The Job Training Partnership Act as it applies to the needs of Vietnam veterans is a band-aid for a traumatic amputation. In fiscal year 1982 more than 1.1 million Vietnam-era veterans were registered for employment help at local job services offices. Only 1 in every 6 of these veterans was actually placed in a job and 1 in 18 found permanent full-time employment paying more than the $5 an hour that the Government figures is necessary to support a family of four at the poverty level.

So, for even those veterans who were placed, two out of every three either received less than $5 an hour, or received only part-time or temporary jobs with a sharp reduction in income.

The $9.4 million under part 4(c) of the Job Training Partnership Act, which will become available in fiscal year 1984 for local veter-

ans employment and training, will only begin to turn the tide for this Nation's unemployed veterans. The Massachusetts Vietnam veterans leadership project wants, therefore, to go on record as supporting House Resolution No. 2355.

This bill is called "The Emergency Vietnam Veterans Job Training Act of 1983," and was introduced by Representative Marvin Leath of Texas. Essentially, the bill would provide the subsidies to employers who place veterans in on-the-job training slots within their companies.

Although the program would be administered by the Veterans Administration and although we are extremely fortunate to have Mr. Robert Moakley, a genuine veterans' advocate, as the acting region I director of the Veterans Employment Service for the Department of Labor, I still must support the concept of a House resolution aimed specifically at the employment of Vietnam veterans.

As has been stated earlier, the Job Training Partnership Act, as it is designated, is an encouraging effort in resolving Vietnam veterans' unemployment and job skills needs. However, the Job Training Partnership Act is only a first step in the implementation of a desperately needed comprehensive program.

[Mr. Ducey's prepared statement follows:]

Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program
of Massachusetts, Inc.

50 Stanford St., Suite 800
Boston, MA 02114
617-523-0524

Kevin R. Dunphy
Chairman, Board of Directors

Richard J. Ducey
Executive Director

VETERANS EMPLOYMENT
TESTIMONY

Government Operations Committee;
Manpower and Housing Subcommittee

Honorable Barney Frank, Chairman

Southeastern Massachusetts University
April 25, 1983

Presented by
Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program
of Massachusetts, Inc.

Richard J. Ducey
Executive Director

UNEMPLOYMENT AND RELATED ISSUES

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

During the war years America was enjoying an expanding economy, virtually no inflation, and a wide range of blue collar vocations. This last point is especially significant for Vietnam veterans because so many of them came from blue collar backgrounds. When they returned home and found employment within the industrial sector, they saw no reason for additional vocational education since industrial jobs, especially with overtime, paid so well.

Now, 15 years later, this sector of the employment market is in a shambles, the delimiting date for G.I. bill benefits has come and gone for most Vietnam veterans, and many find themselves unemployed with outdated and useless job skills in the period of their lives that should represent their peak earning years.

Many economists predict that there will be so many changes in American industries such as steel, automobiles and their supporting companies, that a whole generation of workers may be wiped out.

Speaking as a former "rap group" counselor, I would like to make one other point. Vietnam veterans grew up in an era that developed and supported a very strong work ethic. Many veterans who still suffer marginal readjustment problems could be socially rehabilitated by employment opportunities that offer dignity and a sense of self-worth. Failure to recognize this within a therapeutic framework not only creates difficulties for the mental health community but may actually become the single core issue which prevents the rehabilitation process.

Dr. Arthur Blank, Chief of VA Outreach Services Division, has testified at a session of the National Economic Commission (2-21-83, Am. Leg.) that 40 percent of their clients have employment problems. For many of these veterans a decent job could be the road home.

VETERANS EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION

The Jobs Training Partnership Act as it applies to the needs of Vietnam veterans is a band-aid for a traumatic amputation. In fiscal year 1982 more than 1.1 million Vietnam-era veterans were registered for employment help at local job services offices. Only one in every six of these veterans was actually placed in a job and one in 18 found permanent, full-time employment paying more than the five dollars an hour that the government figures is necessary to support a family of four at the poverty level. So, for even those veterans who were placed, two out of every three either received less than five dollars an hour, or received only part-time or temporary jobs with a sharp reduction in income.

The $9.4 million under Part IV-C of the Jobs Training Partnership Act, which will become available in FY1984 for local veterans employment and training, will only begin to turn the tide for this nation's unemployed veterans. The Massachusetts VVLP wants, therefore, to go on record as supporting H.R. 2355. This bill is called "the Emergency Vietnam Veterans Jobs Training Act of 1983" and was introduced by Rep. Marvin Leath of Texas. Essentially, the bill would provide for subsidies to employers who place veterans in on-the-job training slots within their companies. Although the program would be administered by the Veterans Administration and although we are extremely fortunate to have Mr. Robert Moakley, a genuine veterans' advocate, as the Acting Region I Director of the Veterans Employment Service for the Department of Labor, I still must support the concept of a House resolution aimed specifically at the employment of Vietnam veterans. As has been stated earlier, the JTPA as it is designed is an encouraging effort in resolving Vietnam veterans unemployment and job skills needs. However, the JTPA is only a first step in the implementation of a desperately needed program.

Mr. FRANK. Thank you very much.

As I said, and I will ask Dr. Hanratty to come back in a few minutes, and she will explain what is intended with regard to the match of jobs and training, not just yet.

Let me pursue some questions here with regard to the—Mr. Camara, you talked about the people here at SMU who talk to you. Employment problems, are they a major part of the concern with the veterans?

Mr. CAMARA. Yes, they are, and some problems were DES. I have had some of my veterans go out and get their own jobs and within a week after they received their own jobs somebody representing this organization came in, had a pink card, I forget what it is, take their name and social security number and took the credit for finding the veteran a job.

Mr. FRANK. At the State department of employment security?

Mr. CAMARA. Yes. If you are talking about statistics, you are getting false statistics just by that there. I wonder where it is going across the Nation. I don't trust statistics. I have seen other programs for Vietnam veterans where they are only temporary. They last a year, just so the statistics can know, and no offense to anybody. The same veteran is unemployed again. Like was told to me before this panel, when they stop collecting unemployment they are no longer on statistics either, so now I was astonished to hear that. I wonder myself how many veterans are really unemployed.

Mr. FRANK. That is one reason why many people think that the unemployed statistics really misrepresent the unemployed statistics, because you would be, too, unemployed.

What is the experience of the veterans who have been able to graduate from SMU?

Mr. CAMARA. We have been able to find better jobs and the most important thing is maybe they will get rid of their own nightmares. They have been able to replace Vietnam with something that is more constructive in their life; not totally, they still have their times, but most of the times, if you read the newspaper, most of the time when a Vietnam veteran does something, there is a big picture. Like if he jumps off a bridge and 9 out of 10 times he doesn't have a job and he is killing himself when in fact he could have taken somebody else with him.

Mr. FRANK. The education, the 10-year cutoff for education benefits, how about that?

Mr. CAMARA. That is terrible. My personal thing is running out this year. I took some time off. It took me a while to get my head together, and I have had other veterans that dropped out of school. They've gone to night school.

Mr. FRANK. These are people that started and their 10 years run out?

Mr. CAMARA. I can't understand, because I believe the GI bill runs out in 1989. I don't see why it couldn't be expanded to——

Mr. CAMACHO. Why have a limit on it? Readjustment has never occurred to us. That was the point. The VA said so many years is considered to be readjusted. That doesn't work with the Vietnam veteran. It doesn't make sense to me and it is just too much——

Mr. FRANK. The thing on the money for each veteran, you are not asking for more years of schooling or any more amount of money, just be able to do——

Mr. CAMACHO. People who haven't used it can retrain.

Mr. DUCEY. For so many of the veterans that I have counseled, they have not taken advantage of their GI benefits because when they were first eligible the anti-war sentiments were seated in the college campuses. They felt that they could not deal with that peer pressure at that point in their lives, so they left with 1 or 2 years' college.

For our fathers, vocational rehabilitation was adequate; for us it is not. A man who is in blue collar training now has got to have three or four skills to remain employable, even benefits for his family.

Mr. CAMACHO. We have the Federal outreach program. We believe in that program. If the State takes that up, that may work, the veterans outreach centers being expanded for the justification.

Mr. FRANK. If the State takes what up?

Mr. CAMACHO. Like the lady who testified earlier said: They are going to try to set up some outreach programs with some discretional programs. We need people to be in jobs, go to Digital and say, give us so many people. We are talking about that Federal Job Training Partnership Act.

The point is the training and the point is getting on that PIC, and the point is that there is too much discrimination. The people that run the social services in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts are basically not attuned to veterans' preference at all.

Mr. KING. And sometimes patently anti-veteran.

Mr. FRANK. Identify yourself for the record.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL G. KING, EXECUTIVE OFFICER, VIETNAM VETERANS ASSOCIATION OF BOSTON

Mr. KING. For the purposes of the record, my name is Michael G. King. I am executive officer of the Vietnam Veteran Association of Boston and——

Mr. FRANK. Go ahead.

Mr. KING. First of all, Mr. Frank, I would like to thank you very much. I remember on the 22d of March where there was a partisan hatchet fight going on; you voted 2½ hours, the longest any member of the delegation stayed with me.

Mr. FRANK. I appreciate it, but let's go.

Mr. KING. Mr. Frank, my principle purpose in speaking today is to speak about this cloudy atmosphere that Mr. Camacho referenced that exists in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We enjoy tremendous support of our congressional delegation as witnessed by the 22d of March meeting, our second annual that we had with our delegation. But within the infrastructure of the Commonwealth delivery of social services, we are in a terrible plight.

First of all, the people that now administer the middle level of social managers of this Commonwealth were themselves students, mostly during the 1960's at the height of the anti-war movement. All of us in this room, without exception, are prisoners of our own background and thoughts and prejudices. Hopefully whether we

are liberals or conservative, we are that way because of a good conscience. But as I said, there has been a malignant media image that has already been the cook for 15 years that has so notably affected public image. Administrators perceive Vietnam veterans many times as drug-crazed psychopaths ready to do damage to themselves or to the community.

Unfortunately, the damage that they do is mostly to themselves. Whether anyone in Massachusetts government cares to address this issue, I put it before this body as it affects our horrendous 34-percent unemployment rate. The people in government that still nurture negative feelings toward us cannot do so any longer, there is an ascendant public sentiment from a grass roots level that asks the people in State government to address our problems.

The thinly veiled scorn that is sometimes accorded Vietnam veterans is now growing to be a more hazardous political liability. One thing that I think emphasizes this more particularly than anything else—and it is not only symbolic, it is symptomatic is what happened on the 6th of January 1983, at the time of the change of administrations—is that about 32 or 35 minutes prior to Governor King's departure as the State's chief executive, he signed an executive order targeting Vietnam veterans as an affirmative action minority.

This would have given their potential employers tax advantages, it is already hard enough to get jobs, but to give them that tax advantage for their training and second it gave for about 35 minutes all Vietnam veterans in the State the hope that we would not end up being economic dinosaurs going into our middle age underemployed or unemployed, facing, as I said, thinly veiled hostility. That Executive order at this time is in the words of one person, "lost in space." It has never been reissued.

Subsequent thoughts of its reissue will put us somewhere in an antivivacious clause and this is most disheartening. This comes with the present administration——

Mr. FRANK. Mr. King, the focus of this is on the Job Training Partnership Act and how it can be implemented. You know, I don't mean to cut you off, but the focus here is on the Job Training Partnership Act. It is a congressional hearing. There is a limit to what State issues can be addressed, and I don't want to give you the impression that I have the jurisdiction and I don't.

The formation of the State job training coordination council, that is an issue before us. The formation of the PICS, that is an issue before us, but the focus has to be on Federal training.

Mr. KING. I support, then, the amendments that were referenced earlier that would make the State government responsible for the Job Training Partnership Act. That all pressure be brought to bear to make the State government more responsive to the needs of Vietnam veterans and also in the PICS that the political leadership be appraised of what our needs are and that the political advocacy begin to become a coordinated effort and thank you very much for this opportunity.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Ducey, I want to ask you, given your experience, assuming that you had the kinds of representation that is so adequate on the council and on the PICS, what kinds of things, are there particular things that ought to be done with regard to the

Vietnam vets' needs, are there more specialized training? How would you be advising these organizations to function as they are setting up specific training programs?

Mr. DUCEY. Again, wherever possible because we are very concerned about training for the short-term gains and I believe you mentioned earlier that Vietnam veterans are in an age bracket now that if they are not in essentially a career opportunity within the next 5 years, they may be relegated to part-time employment, seasonal employment for the rest of their lives and be cut out from career opportunities.

Of course, I favor and support training toward the high tech industry wherever it is feasible, geographically feasible because the industries within the Commonwealth do have such a strong base and is looking at a future of expansion and growth. From what we can see the Job Training Partnership Act is designed to avoid those kinds of deadend jobs that came about as a result of CETA and we would be very concerned about—again, almost seasonal, you know, non-career-type training programs.

Mr. FRANK. All right. As I said, Dr. Hanratty will be back to address those issues in a minute. I also wanted to focus on the Federal issues, the educational question. I agree, it is appalling to me that we would say to young people that have come back from Vietnam, dealt with the problems that has caused, got themselves organized, went to school, maybe work part time as it is because they have families to support and because an arbitrary 10-year deadline to have them cut off from assistance is a great mistake, particularly when other forms of student assistance are being cut back.

If there are any figures of the people who have been forced to leave because of that 10-year date or anybody who could get some indication on it, I would find that very helpful because we do have legislation that would repeal that 10-year date and anything you can do that could give us statistics——

Mr. CAMARA. I can probably find out from this school.

Mr. FRANK. That would be very helpful.

With regard to the PICS, they are, I guess just information, the statute requires that they be a majority controlled by private businesses or potential employers, but that obviously leaves a lot of room for representatives of target groups. I notice that the regulations, I guess it was or the statute said with regard to State councils, that at least 20 percent of the membership on the council have to be from people who are in the targeted group, not each targeted group, but combined so there is some flexibility there so I am hopeful that we will get that kind of representation today.

I think we got some suggestions today from Dr. Hanratty. I am going to recall her in a minute, just to ask her to address this question on job training, but I do want to say to the veterans and make one specific promise and that is this, this is not in my judgment a one-time hearing.

I wanted to do this early just as a Job Training Partnership Act is beginning to be implemented. I intend as part of this subcommittee to make it a continuing monitoring effort on the Job Training Partnership Act as a whole, and particularly about training for Vietnam veterans. It is inadequate for the whole country. It is pitifully inadequate with regard to veterans.

Obviously if we don't do things to change things, if we don't expand the job training that we offer Vietnam veterans beyond the limitations of title 4(c), we will be in this country a kind of hypocrisy by making ourselves feel good by saying that we did something for the Vietnam veterans, but not having done anything, because a nationwide allocation as small as this because of the large number of people who are unemployed is almost insulting.

Obviously, we want to see if we can expand that through the 10 percent undesignated factor and so I appreciate your coming and I hope—I know that you will be concerned with the implementation of the councils and the kinds of things that they set up.

Let me ask Dr. Hanratty, you heard the concern about the nature of jobs and I guess it was a twofold thing. Would there be the kind of jobs people would want to go through training to get? Would they be worth it and secondly, would there really be jobs at the end?

Ms. HANRATTY. The leaf raking example I think is indicative of the public opinion generally of CETA, particularly of the public sector employment section of CETA where in fact people, Vietnam veterans and many others were put to work within the localities raking leaves and working in parks, things like that.

There is no public sector employment title under JTPA at this time. We don't anticipate that there will be unless Representative Frank would indicate otherwise. We are certainly not expecting it. The jobs that will be trained for under JTPA will be jobs in growth industry and also in stable industries. The localities through the private industry councils and the local elected officials will develop plans which are specific to their areas, whether it is New Bedford, Fall River, the Cape, Lowell, Lawrence, whatever, in fact they have to be specific for that area.

Overall on a State level, however, we are committed to training for jobs which will exist in the future and which are not dead end jobs because to train now for a dead end job just means that you go back and retrain whether it is in 12 months or 2 years. It is not productive for the individuals and our concern is very much with the individuals.

It is also an absolute waste of funds. The jobs which will be trained for will be targeted to the areas. They will have to take into consideration labor market growth, the demands of labor within the area, the growth sectors and not all of them will be in the high tech industry.

High tech has become and is a very important industry and has become the catch phrase if you want a job to go high tech. In fact, the growth for jobs in high tech has decreased over the past year or 2 years.

In fact, there will be training for high tech, but there will also be training in other industries that are stable or growing, but growing at a slower rate. The State is committed to it. It is a requirement in the Job Training Partnership Act and it will be targeted and paid attention to at very high levels by both the State council and the State administration.

In terms of the PICS and the State Job Training Coordinating Council, they are fairly prescribed by the act in terms of what percentages of whom has to be on the council. On the PICS, they are

fairly prescribed by the act in terms of what percentages of whom has to be on the council. On the PICS, it is 51 percent which have to be—percent of the Council has to be business and we do have some packets, informational packets and will be doing briefings—we are developing scheduled briefings throughout the State, but we do have a packet.

It is available if anyone would like it. They can contact the Department of Economic Affairs and bring it to the attention of Jason Albert; that telephone number is 727-8380.

I spoke to Mr. Moakley very briefly before the hearing began to discuss how it is the other States are dealing with veterans; which category they are putting them in. We began that discussion. We will continue that discussion and as the regulations for private industry councils are developed, we will find a way that the Department of Labor will accept through which we will include veterans.

Mr. FRANK. Let me say, I appreciate that. I will guarantee you that there will be no objection on the part of the Department of Labor to legitimately designate Vietnam veterans. The unemployed, I think we are talking about either enlisted men or maybe people who have been noncommissioned officers, but I don't think commissioned officers would be considered by most people to be representative of most of the people.

Ms. HANRATTY. I certainly agree.

Mr. FRANK. That ought to be made clear to the PICS. I realize that it does say in the statute that a majority of the membership of the council will be owners of business, chief executives, et cetera, but it doesn't otherwise restrict who you appoint and they are representatives of educational agencies, organized labor rehabilitation agencies, community-based organizations, and the public employment service.

I don't think there will be any problem there. Are community-based organizations, for instance, for Vietnam veterans clearly in the statute. Certainly on a State level. if you add it up, 93 percent of the council has to be in one category or another which leaves us with one or two places, but about 20 percent of those who are designated to be representatives of the targeted groups, so that would mean——

Ms. HANRATTY. Eight people on our council. That is what it came out to.

Mr. FRANK. When did eight come——

Ms. HANRATTY. We started out with 40.

Mr. FRANK. They have 50 on the council now.

Ms. HANRATTY. So it is 10.

Mr. FRANK. At least 10, then you have that 7 percent; you could have up to 11 and I would think there would be room for a couple of Vietnam veterans. I am impressed and I think it becomes clear to you that we have some people who thought very seriously about the needs of Vietnam veterans.

Nobody has asked that they be on there just for show. I have been impressed and I think it has come out here that the people in the Vietnam veterans groups have thought long and hard about their brothers' needs in terms of employment and I recommend that to enhance the program and to enhance their ability to serve that population because they also understand not just the needs,

but the skepticism, the bitter experiences, the outreach is important and outreach has to be done by people who understand what the obstacles are. People who have had bad experiences, so I think that is very important. The Lieutenant Governor is on the way and I think it is also fair to give the reporter a bit of a break so the hearing will be in recess for a period of time.

[Recess taken.]

Mr. FRANK. The hearing will reconvene.

There has been some problem in arrangements for our last witness so we will make Lieutenant Governor Kerry's statement a part of the record and we will stand adjourned.

[Mr. Kerry's prepared statement follows:]

STATEMENT
LT. GOVERNOR JOHN F. KERRY, THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY TODAY ON TITLE IV OF THE JTPA PROGRAM REGARDING VIETNAM VETERANS. IT IS A REFRESHING FORUM TO SEE THAT CONCERNS OF VIETNAM VETERANS ARE BEING ADDRESSED IN A TANGIBLE AND CONCRETE FASHION.

AS LT. GOVERNOR I AM CONCERNED ABOUT THE EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS WHICH FACE A NUMBER OF RESIDENTS IN THE COMMONWEALTH. HOWEVER, AS A PUBLIC OFFICIAL AND VIETNAM VETERAN, I AM ACUTELY AWARE OF THE UNIQUE AND PREVAILING EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS FACING VIETNAM VETERANS. WHILE I AM HEARTENED THAT THE EMPLOYMENT CONCERNS OF VETERANS ARE BEING ADDRESSED WITH THE EMPLOYMENT CONCERNS OF ALL THROUGH THE JTPA PROGRAM, I SERIOUSLY QUESTION THE ABILITY TO EFFECTIVELY IMPLEMENT TITLE IV IN LIGHT OF THE PAST AND EXISTING STATUS OF CERTAIN VETERAN ORGANIZATIONS WHICH ARE INTEGRALLY INVOLVED IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS ENDEAVOR.

IT IS THE INTENTION OF TITLE IV TO PROVIDE ACTIVITIES OR SUPPLEMENT PRESENTLY EXISTING EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS FUNDED BY FEDERAL, STATE, OR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, TO SERVE VETERANS NOT "ADEQUATELY PROVIDED" FOR BY OTHER PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS, AND TO CONDUCT OUTREACH ACTIVITIES TO PROMOTE JOB TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES TO VIETNAM VETERANS. TO CONDUCT THESE ACTIVITIES IT IS MANDATED BY THE DESIGN OF TITLE IV THAT, IN VARYING DEGREES THAT THE VETERANS' AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF VETERANS EMPLOYMENT, AND VETERANS EMPLOYMENT SERVICES (VES), BE DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS PARTICULAR PHASE OF THE JTPA PROGRAM.

THE MOST FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION WHICH MUST BE ADDRESSED IS HOW CAN THESE EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES BE EFFECTIVELY EXECUTED IN BEHALF OF VIETNAM VETERANS

WHEN WE DON'T KNOW WHO THEY ARE OR WHERE THEY ARE LOCATED? HOW CAN WE APPROPRIATELY DESIGN EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS FOR UNEMPLOYED VIETNAM VETERANS WHEN WE DON'T KNOW WHO THE UNEMPLOYED ARE? PRESENTLY, THERE DOES NOT EXIST A COMPLETE NOR ACCURATE DATA BANK WHICH LISTS VIETNAM VETERANS, LET ALONE UNEMPLOYED VETERANS. THE MOST WIDELY UTILIZED SOURCE TO IDENTIFY VETERANS IS THROUGH THE BONUS CHECK LIST. THIS LIST CONSISTS OF THE VETERANS WHO RECEIVED THEIR BONUS CHECKS SINCE THEIR DEPARTURE FROM THE SERVICE. HOWEVER, THIS PROVIDES AN INACCURATE FORM OF DATA AT BEST. FOR EXAMPLE, ONE VETERAN I KNOW RECEIVED HIS BONUS CHECK IN 1968 WHICH WAS DELIVERED TO HIS MOTHER'S RESIDENCE. IN THE LAST 14 YEARS HE HAS LIVED IN 3 STATES AND 12 DIFFERENT ADDRESSES. THIS EXAMPLE IS ALL TOO TYPICAL OF THE INACCURATE DATA BASE WHICH EXISTS FOR VIETNAM VETERANS. ON THIS PREMISE ALONE HOW CAN WE ACCURATELY, IF AT ALL, LOCATE AND IDENTIFY UNEMPLOYED VETERANS. THE INABILITY TO IDENTIFY THIS GROUP FOR SERVICES DOES NOT ONLY ENGENDER THE INEFFECTIVE DISPENSING OF SERVICES, IT MORE OFTEN TIMES THAN NOT DEPRIVES THOSE INDIVIDUALS OF SERVICES FOR WHICH THEY HAVE AN ACUTE NEED. IN THIS CASE THE VICTIMS ARE, ONCE AGAIN, THE VIETNAM VETERANS.

FURTHERMORE, IT IS MANDATED IN TITLE IV THAT WHILE OASVE WILL RETAIN DIRECT RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FORMULATION OF JOB TRAINING POLICIES, THE VES FUNDED STAFF WILL PRIMARILY BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL/STATE EMPLOYMENT GRANT PROGRAMS. YET, TO USE MASSACHUSETTS AS AN EXAMPLE, OF THE 293 STATE VES AGENTS AND DIRECTORS ONLY 12, OR 4.2% ARE VIETNAM VETERANS.

IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THERE ARE 260,000 VIETNAM VETERANS IN MASSACHUSETTS, WHICH IS 32.3 % OF THE TOTAL VETERAN POPULATION OF THIS STATE, THIS REPRESENTS A GROSS MISREPRESENTATION OF VIETNAM VETERANS. HOW IS IT POSSIBLE TO ASCERTAIN THE EMPLOYMENT NEEDS OF THE VIETNAM VETERAN, PARTICULARLY AT THE LOCAL LEVEL, WHEN THERE ARE SO FEW VIETNAM VETERANS AS VES FIELD AGENTS WITH NO RELEVANT DATA BASE TO AID THEM IN THEIR OUTREACH WORK.

THE FEDERAL MANDATES ESTABLISHED REGARDING THE COMPOSITION OF THE STATEWIDE JOB TRAINING COUNCIL FURTHER COMPOUNDS THE PROBLEM OF REPRESENTATION FOR VIETNAM VETERANS. IT IS STATED THAT NOT LESS THAN 20% OF THE APPOINTEES TO THE STATEWIDE COUNCIL MUST BE FROM STATE AGENCIES, INCLUDING STATE VETERANS AFFAIRS. HOWEVER, IN VIEW OF THE SPARSE REPRESENTATION OF VIETNAM VETERANS IN THE AGENCY, AND THE LACK OF A MANDATED ALLOCATION OF VIETNAM VETERANS TO THE STATEWIDE COUNCIL, IT CANNOT BE SAID THAT THE APPOINTEES REASONABLY REPRESENT THE POPULATION OF THE STATE IN REFERENCE TO VIETNAM VETERANS.

THEREFORE, IN LIGHT OF THE EXISTING CONDITIONS REGARDING VIETNAME VETERANS, THERE IS REASON TO BE CONCERNED THAT THE TITLE IV OF THE JTPA CAN EFFECTIVELY AND EQUITABLY BE IMPLEMENTED IN THIS RESPECT. HOWEVER, I DO BELIEVE THIS SITUATION COULD READILY BE RECTIFIED THROUGH CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVES AND OVERSIGHT. I WOULD RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING:

- A VETERANS HIRING PREFERENCE BE ESTABLISHED, SUCH AS THAT OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. DUE TO THE AVERAGE AGE OF VIETNAM VETERANS AND THE LENGTHY DURATION OF THEIR SERVICE, THEY ARE OFTEN THE LAST HIRED AND THE FIRST FIRED. THIS MEASURE SHOULD BE ESPECIALLY TARGETED TO DISPLACED WORKERS.

- GIVE PRIORITY TO THOSE PROGRAMS ESPECIALLY DESIGNED TO AID VIETNAM VETERANS UNDER TITLE IV.

- INCREASE THE REPRESENTATION OF VIETNAM VETERANS IN PERCENTAGES PROPORTIONATE TO THEIR POPULATION WITHIN EACH STATE IN ALL VETERANS AGENCIES, THE STATEWIDE JOB TRAINING COUNCILS, AND ALL JTPA AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS.

- EXTEND AND IMPROVE THE OUTREACH EFFORTS TO VIETNAM VETERANS, BY REQUIRING THE COMPUTERIZATION OF ALL VETERAN'S AGENCIES TO IMPROVE THE DATA BASE IN RECORDING VIETNAM VETERANS.

- ESTABLISH STATISTICAL SERVICE LEVELS TO BE MET AND REQUIRE A REPORTING MECHANISM TO THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR. FOR EXAMPLE, REQUIRE THAT AN ANNUAL REPORT BE MADE TO THE CONGRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF LABOR REGARDING JTPA SERVICES TO VIETNAM VETERANS.

As we know, JTPA returns a great deal of control over employment and training programs to the states. JTPA clearly leaves many basic decisions up to state government. This general principle is also true when it comes to Vietnam veterns. Let me suggest three actions as examples of what we in this state can do.

First, we can require, in our State Coordinating Plan and in our JTPA Goals and Objectives, that Vietnam veterans are served in every SDA in our state at a level at least equal to their portion of the eligible population.

Second, we can guarantee that a fair share of all those trained under the Dislocated Workers Program (Title III) are Vietnam veterans. This simply requires that the state evaluation criteria for proposals under Title III reflect their priority.

Third, the Governor's 22% discretionary training funds and his 10% Job Service fund can be used to focus on the special needs of Vietnam veterans...these decisions are up to the state.

So, these are some key steps to be taken in Washington and in Massachusetts that will assure that Vietnam veterans are equitably served by the new Job Training Partnership Act.

- o CONGRESS SHOULD SPECIFY IN THE LAW ITSELF THAT VIETNAM VETERANS MUST BE SERVED AT A LEVEL THAT IS AT LEAST EQUAL TO THEIR PROPORTION IN THE ELIGIBLE POPULATION. THEN, THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR MUST REVIEW STATE PLANS AND MONITOR STATE PERFORMANCE TO ASSURE THAT THIS REQUIREMENT IS BEING MET THROUGHOUT THE NATION.

I AN CONFIDENT THAT THROUGH THESE MEASURES THE JTPA PROGRAMS, PARTICULATLY REGARDING VIETNAM VETERANS, WILL HELP ALLEVIATE THE EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS THEY CURRENTLY FACE. I WILL DO EVERYTHING I CAN IN FULL COOPERATION WITH YOU, CONGRESSMAN FRANK, AND THE REST OF THE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, IN AN EFFORT TO DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT THESE INITIATIVES.

[Whereupon, at 10:55 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

BARNEY FRANK, MASS., CHAIRMAN
MEL LEVINE, CALIF.
MAJOR R. OWENS, N.Y.
JOHN M. SPRATT, JR., S.C.
JOE SKEEN, N.M.
DAN BURTON, IND.
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, ILL.
225-6751

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

MANPOWER AND HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, ROOM B-349-A
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515

May 9, 1983

As Chairman of the Manpower and Housing Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, I recently held a hearing on unemployment problems of Vietnam Veterans and the Job Training Partnership Act.

The veterans expressed their relief that job training is necessary and they also cited the fear that the statewide councils and local private industry councils would be making decisions on the usage of JTPA funds without input from the Vietnam Veterans themselves.

I am urging you, as a result of the information gained in that hearing, to appoint Vietnam era veterans to your statewide council, and to urge local leaders to include them on PICs. I think that it will be useful to begin JTPA on the right foot, seeking to tailor programs directly to the needs of clients.

Including Vietnam Veterans in these councils will help us meet the objectives of the program.

BARNEY FRANK
Chairman, Manpower and
Housing Subcommittee

BF/MBC/ls

(33)

LIONEL A. MORAIS
AGENT

Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Veterans' Services

Town of Swansea, Massachusetts
VETERANS' BENEFITS DEPARTMENT
TOWN HALL, MAIN STREET
SWANSEA, MASSACHUSETTS 02777
TELEPHONE 673-9814

May 5, 1983

Congressman Barney Frank
10 Purchase Street

Dear Barney:

After attending the Conference you hosted at Southeastern Massachusetts University, I did say to you that I would give you a written opinion of my views of the situation and at least allow you to have something written. Here goes:

It seems that the ONLY people having any security are those who had a job when they went into the Military Service meaning that, perhaps we should look into some sort of job matching just before Veterans are released from Active Duty, such as the Federal Job Bulletins, the VA Recruitement Bulletins, etc.

Currently, Veterans are allowed a 24 Hour advance notice on available jobs, but this seems to be very restrictive as this means they must spend money to gasoline to go to a Regional Office to look at the files EVERY day. More time should be allowed.

We have a Senior Aide Program which is National in scope; why not present a package to combat the joblessness rate among Viet Nam Era Veterans along the same basic lines? We know it will not need to be as long term as the Senior Aide program, but we can limit it perhaps to a five year plan so that some training can be given to Veterans to further expand their experience resume. The average age for a Viet Nam Veteran is now 34 years and much more delay in implementing a program of some sore will put them in the "unhireable" age bracket. With monies for training, we Veterans' Agents can even "hire" for training to given the Veteran some added experience in the many areas of Veterans Affairs.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
SPECIAL COMMISSION ON THE
CONCERNS OF THE VIETNAM VETERANS
ROOM 1001 LEVERETT SALTONSTALL BUILDING
100 CAMBRIDGE STREET, BOSTON, MA 02202

HON. MICHAEL S. DUKAKIS
GOVERNOR

HON. FRANCIS D. DORIS, CHAIRMAN
(617) 722-1660

HON. THOMAS J. VALLELY, VICE CHAIRMAN

MEMBERS
HON. JOSEPH B. WALSH
HON. ANGELO M. SCACCIA
CHARLES M. COLLATOS
DR. LOUIS GARTONHERRY
ALLAN N. GREEN
HON. JAMES M. CONNOLLY
DAVID ENTIN
DR. DAVID A. FINKEL
JAMES FITZPATRICK
DONALD L. JENNINGS
DR. JOHN McCAHAN
DR. RICHARD M. RYAN
STEPHEN ZARDIS
MICHAEL SULLIVAN
WALTER COTTER

PAUL R. CAMACHO
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
(617) 722-1167

April 22, 1983

Barney Frank
Chairman, Manpower and Housing Subcommittee
Rayburn House Office Building, Room B-349-A
Washington, D.C. 20515

In behalf of the entire Commission, I would like to thank you for the opportunity you have extended to us today. As you may be aware, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts' Special Commission on the Concerns of Vietnam Veterans was established to investigate and study the issues of concern to the Vietnam Veterans in our Commonwealth, and file a report on the status of the Vietnam Veterans together with administrative and legislative recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature.

Briefly, it may do to note that these issues of concern range from concerns very particular to the nature of the war and Homecomer experience to those staple issues of interest to all citizens. It has become obviously apparent that there is no lynch pin problem which if solved will eliminate or resolve the issues. Rather, these concerns overlap or superimpose upon each other making the plight of the Vietnam Veteran a very complex social problem. Each of these difficulties has to be squarely faced and at least partially surmounted in order for general improvement in the social condition of the Vietnam Veteran to take place.

In behalf of the Vietnam Veterans, this Commission cares to note several interelated and salient points pertaining to the employment situation for Vietnam Veterans.

First, as you are certainly aware, the employment situation among Vietnam Veterans is quite poor. That is especially the case among those ex-enlisted personnel who came from the urban areas. While statistics can and are always subject to dispute, the Commission holds that here in Massachusetts unemployment among Vietnam Veterans is certainly close to 15%. For minorities it is at least in the mid 20%. Further, this perhaps does not reflect that

"invisible" population of those who are off all rolls and also do not receive any services. In any case, as could be expected, among the Vietnam Veteran population, those most in need are those with the least skills.

Second, it is without doubt that more, and higher levels of education are required than ever before. It may be said that the era of any individual pursuing one or two career tracks in his working lifetime has passed, given the present employment environment. In the trades, horizontal or transferable multiple skills are increasingly important if one is to survive cut backs and lay offs. Similarly in the "white collar" world the undergraduate degree is often not enough for entry, much less advancement. What is needed is education/training for jobs for the future.

Third, as you are aware, this Commission's initial findings (a skeleton or abstract of which is to be published as our Interim Report Senate 1824 in the very near future) indicate a direct correlation between the negative public image and lack of employment opportunities. This negative image has resulted in employment discrimination. In fact, one of the state civil service employment cases in which our Commission was asked to intercede touched on this very fact. We suggest that this discrimination along with unemployment and lack of educational/technical skills is a national problem. Vietnam Veterans in this nation have been socially, politically, and economically discriminated against since they returned from Vietnam. They represent a disadvantaged group but go unrecognized. That is, there exists no breakout in national statistics readily available on unemployment figures and unemployment rates for Vietnam Veterans. Consequently, they are never viewed as a population in need, and thus routinely excluded from consideration in such governmental services, or are thrown in (as in Sec. 203 A 2 of the FJTPA) with dropouts, alcoholics, offenders, and addicts.

All this brings us to the discussion of how well can Vietnam Veterans expect to fair with regard to implementation of the Federal Job Training Partnership Act. The program represents an opportunity for tangible gains to be made in terms of job training and presumably job placement for Vietnam Veterans. However, our fear is that this opportunity may not be realized.

What especially worries us here are the parallels to the CETA Program. In that program, the Carter administration mandated 35% hiring for Title VI programs. In our Commonwealth, a brief and simple survey conducted in 1978 by the Vietnam Veterans Civic Council indicated that well under 25% of the Title VI positions went to veterans. Further this was accidental; that is, the individual in need qualified under other criteria and also happened to be a veteran. There was no significant input to the various prime sponsors and consortiums, the so called advisory boards not withstanding.

The fact is that the composition of the Governor's State Job Training Coordinating Council is woefully deficient in terms of veteran representation. Vietnam Veterans in this Commonwealth have already experienced their fears to this Commission that the Private Industry Councils will follow suit. Now if this is to be the trend here in this Commonwealth where Vietnam Veterans have the support of both Senate President William M. Bulger and Speaker of the House Thomas W. McGee, in this Commonwealth where Vietnam Veterans have strong support within the congressional delegation, one member of which is the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, then what can the Vietnam Veteran expect will happen in the rest of the Union.

To insure that Vietnam Veterans receive their fair share under the Federal Job Training Partnership Act, this Commission recommends the following:

Vietnam Veterans must be firmly established as a target population in Title II and III of the program as a distinctly identified population to be served. Further, it is the feeling of the Commission that the chief elected and administrative officials in the service delivery areas be made clearly aware that Vietnam Veterans be served. This will require that amendments be made in the implementation regulation guidelines to include veterans and Vietnam Veteran groups on the Private Industry Councils.

Finally, this Commission implores all of Congress not to surrender perogative and power for the program solely to the state administrations. Oversight functions are too little too late for us. Congressional influence must be present throughout program implementation.

Years of alienation and "official neglect" have made it extremely difficult for many Vietnam Veterans to establish themselves. The Federal Job Training Partnership Act represents a significant opportunity but one which will only be realized by full access to the program. This not only requires being designated as a target population, but also must include direct participation in program design, implementation, and administration.

In behalf of the entire Commission, I wish to thank you once again for the opportunity to testify at these hearings today and for your attention to the concerns of the Vietnam Veterans of this Nation.

Sincerely yours,

Paul R. Camacho
Executive Director

PRC/kaz